

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19, and 23-25 of the present application remain pending. Claims 1, 11, and 19 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,574), hereinafter referred to as "Saw," in view of Mese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,396,443), hereinafter referred to as "Mese." The Applicants respectfully submit that the recited embodiments of the present invention are not rendered obvious by Saw alone, or in combination with Mese. Claim 1 of the present invention recites (emphasis added):

An input detection system for an electronic device comprising:  
a cover coupled to said electronic device by a hinge;  
a first display component;  
a second display component disposed within said cover wherein said second display component is disposed above said first display component when said cover is in a closed position and wherein said second display component is sufficiently transparent to permit viewing of said first display component when said cover is in a closed position;  
a processor;  
a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with the surface of said electronic device and wherein said sensor is operable to differentiate between a first height and a second height of said indication above the surface of said second display component when said cover is in a closed position above said first display component; and  
a control circuit coupled to said sensor component, to said processor, to said first display component, and to said second display component, said control circuit operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device and, in response to said differentiating, to make one of said

first display component and said second display component an active display component.

Claims 11 and 19 are directed to capacitive and inductive detection systems respectively and recite similar claim limitations. The Applicants respectfully submit that Saw does not teach or suggest a sensor which is operable to differentiate between a first height and a second height of an indication above the surface of either the first or second display device as claimed. Instead, Saw teaches that sensor 48 provides a signal indicative of whether cover 12 is in an open or closed position (column 3, lines 42-44). However, Saw does not teach or suggest that the sensor is capable of differentiating the height of any type of indication as claimed. More specifically, Saw does not teach or suggest that the sensor is operable to differentiate the height of an indication above the surface of the second display component when the cover is in a closed position above the first display component as claimed. As a result, the apparatus of Saw is not capable of determining whether an indication is for selecting a first display component or a second display component as the active display component as recited in Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention.

The rejection states that the detection of an open or closed cover above a display teaches the recited claim limitation of differentiating between a first height and a second height of an indication of an input. The Applicants respectfully submit that detecting whether a cover is open or closed does not teach or suggest detecting

and indication of an input. For example, Saw does not teach or suggest that opening the cover is interpreted as an input of any sort to the electronic device. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is ignoring the plain English meaning of the recited claim limitations in order to selectively fit the parameters of the present claimed invention.

Regarding the cited combinations, the Applicants respectfully submit that Mese fails to overcome the shortcomings of Saw. For example, Mese does not teach or suggest that the sensors used are capable of differentiating the height of an indication above the surface of a second display in the manner recited in Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention. Specifically, the apparatus of Mese can detect the presence of an operating medium such as a pen or finger within a certain radius from the information processing apparatus. However, Mese does not teach or suggest that the sensors can differentiate a first height and a second height of the operating medium above the sensor as claimed. As a result, the apparatus of Mese is not capable of determining whether an indication is for selecting a first display component or a second display component as the active display component as recited in Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention.

For example, in an embodiment of the present invention, the sensor component can differentiate whether the indication is, for example, 10 millimeters above the surface of the electronic device or 5 millimeters above the surface of the

electronic device. In response to the differentiating, the control circuit may activate either the first display component or the second display component. Therefore, when the cover of the electronic device is closed and the second display component is disposed above the first display component, the differentiating initiates activating either the upper or lower display component. In contrast, apparatus of Mese merely detects when the operation media is within a certain radius from the surface of the information processing apparatus. However, because Mese does not teach or suggest that sensor 102 can differentiate between a first height and a second height of the operation media above the information processing apparatus, it is incapable of activating either of a first or second display component as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention.

The rejection cites figures 6 and 7 of Mese as well as column 10, lines 7-54 as teaching the differentiation between a first height and a second height of the operation media above the information processing apparatus. The Applicants respectfully submit that Mese does not teach or suggest the differentiation between the first height and the second height, but instead teaches the detection, within a detection radius, of the stylus. The rejection further indicates that Mese teaches a first height (e.g., greater than 10mm) and a second height (e.g., 8mm) of the indication. The Applicants respectfully submit that this is a mis-interpretation of the teaching of Mese. Mese teaches in column 10, lines 10-22 (emphasis added):

If a stylus pen 600 for the electromagnetic induction system tablet 601 of the table 1 is used as an operation medium, then as is conventional, the approach of the stylus pen 600 can be detected event when a distance between the pen 600 and the tablet 601 is about 10 mm. Therefore, even when the liquid crystal display panel 603 with the back light 604 having a thickness of about 5 to 7 mm and a surface protecting glass 607 having a thickness of several millimeters are interposed between the stylus pen 600 and the tablet 601, the approach of the stylus pen 600 can be detected through the liquid crystal display panel 603 and the surface protecting glass 607.

The Applicants understand the above cited portion as stating that the approach of the stylus can be detected within a radius of approximately 10mm. Thus, even though the back light 604, having a thickness of about 5 to 7mm, and surface protecting glass 607, having a thickness of several millimeters, are interposed between the stylus pen and tablet 601, it is still within the detection radius of tablet 601. In other words, Mese is teaching that the combination of liquid display panel 603, back light 604 and surface protecting glass 607 still allows stylus pen 600 to come within the detection radius (10mm) of tablet 601.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Saw and Mese does not teach or suggest a sensor which is operable to differentiate between a first height and a second height of an indication above the surface of either a first or second display component as claimed, or for causing a control circuit to make the first display component or the second display component the active display component as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1, 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

Claims 2-4 and 8-10 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 2-4, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 15-19 depend from Claim 11 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 23-25 depend from Claim 19 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19, and 23-25 overcome the rejections of record and therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. The Applicants do not find these references to teach or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S 5,579,037.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 12/22/2005



Anthony C. Murabito

Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060